

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by NCITS, “Fibre Channel Generic Services – 3, Rev. 7.01,” November, 2000 (hereinafter “NCITS”).

Claims 1, 3-6, and 15-18 have been cancelled. As to claim 7, Applicant respectfully submits that NCITS does not teach at least the following elements: “determining if the Common Transport Information Unit corresponds to selectors of a first entry in a security database, wherein the determining includes comparing a class of traffic of the Common Transport Information Unit against a class of traffic identified in the first entry.” and “when it is determined that the Common Transport Information Unit corresponds to the selectors of the first entry: assigning a security association identification to the Common Transport Information Unit; creating a second entry in the security database, the second entry including the security association identification and key and algorithm information; encrypting a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit using the key and algorithm information associated with the entry in the security database; and transmitting the Common Transport Information Unit to the second network entity.”

Specifically, NCITS does not teach or suggest assigning a SAID to the CT\_IU, creating an entry in the security table corresponding to the SAID, or encrypting the CT\_IU based upon a determination of the whether the class of traffic of the CT IU is identified in an entry in the security database. NCITS is silent regarding the encryption process, except to say that the encryption occurs using an encryption key and algorithm. There is no indication that traffic class is used as a factor in determining whether or not encryption occurs, or even any indication at all that encryption is undertaken via an automated process based on any factors as opposed to simply a case-by-case determination made by an administrator wishing to distribute encrypted data. Claims 7, 13, and 19 have been amended to make this distinction more clear. Support for these changes may be found in the Specification, page 9, lines 24-27. As such, NCITS fails to teach or suggest elements of claim 7 and Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7, 13, and 19 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 9-12 directly or indirectly depend from claims 7 and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Further, these dependent claims recite

additional limitations that when considered in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish the art of record.

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being un-patentable over NCITS in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,794 to Angelo (hereinafter “Angelo”).

Claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled.

Dependent claim 8 directly depends from claim 7 and is therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Further, these dependent claims recite additional limitations that when considered in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish the art of record.

New claims 20-25 have been added which further delineate various aspects of the present invention. Support for these claims may be found in the Specification, page 9, lines 24-27.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in proper form and are in condition for allowance, and request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. It is believed that no fee is due at this time. Should any fee be required for any reason related to this document, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. ANDIP041. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below with any questions or concerns relating to this document or application.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Marc S. Hanish/  
Marc S. Hanish  
Reg. No. 42,626

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(408) 255-8001